REMARKS

In the Office Action of October 12, 2007, the Examiner: (1) objected to the specification; (2) rejected claims 1-2, 13-14 and 20-21 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,029,000 ("Woolsey"); (3) rejected claims 3-5, 15 and 22 as allegedly obvious over Woolsey in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,210,828 ("Bolan"); and (4) rejected claims 6-12, 16-19 and 23-26 as allegedly obvious over Woolsey in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/00624427 ("Chauvel").

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 13, and 20. Applicants believe that the pending claims are allowable and respectfully request reconsideration.

I.   AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATIONS

Applicants amend specification paragraph [0001] to omit an improper reference and to re-include a referenced pending application and its serial number.

Applicants also amend specification paragraph [0037] and [0039] to correct minor grammatical errors and reference numbers to figures. No new matter has been added.

II.   ART BASED REJECTIONS

A.   Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey. Applicant amends claim 1 not to define over prior art in which each processor executes an operating system.

Woolsey is directed to a mobile communication system with cross compiler and cross linker. (Woolsey Title). In particular, Woolsey teaches a wireless data platform comprising a host processor and one or more DSPs or other coprocessors. (Woolsey Col. 2, lines 33-36). Woolsey teaches that the host processor utilizes a host real time operating system. (Woolsey Col. 3, lines 36-38). Further, Woolsey teaches that the DSP or other coprocessor utilizes a DSP real time operating system. (Woolsey Col. 3, lines 52-53). Thus, each processor of Woolsey executes an operating system.

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites "**a single operating system configured to execute exclusively on the first processor.**" Applicants submit that Woolsey does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. In particular, Woolsey teaches that both the host processor and the DSP (or other coprocessor) utilize their own operating system. Thus, Applicants submit that Woolsey teaches different operating systems executing on both the processors and fails to

expressly or inherently teach "**a single operating system configured to execute exclusively on the first processor**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over Woolsey, and none of the other art of record satisfy the deficiencies of Woolsey. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims which depend on claim 1 (claims 2-12) should be allowed.

B.   Claim 13

Claim 13 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey. Applicants amend claim 13 not to define over prior art in which each processor executes an operating system.

Claim 13 specifically recites "**executing a single operating system on only one of a plurality of processors**." Applicants submit that Woolsey does not expressly or inherently teach such a method. In particular, Woolsey teaches that both the host processor and the DSP (or other coprocessor) utilize their own operating system. Thus, Applicants submit that Woolsey teaches different operating systems executing on both (or a plurality of) the processors and fails to expressly or inherently teach "**executing a single operating system on only one of a plurality of processors**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 13 is allowable over Woolsey, and none of the other art of record satisfy the deficiencies of Woolsey. Accordingly, claim 13 and all claims which depend on claim 13 (claims 14-19) should be allowed.

C.   Claim 20

Claim 20 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Woolsey. Applicants amend claim 20 not to define over prior art in which each processor executes an operating system.

Claim 20 specifically recites "a computer-readable medium storing a program that, when executed by a multi-processor system, causes only one of a plurality of processors to **execute a single operating system**." Applicants submit that Woolsey does not expressly or inherently teach such a computer-readable medium. In particular, Woolsey teaches that both the host processor and the DSP (or other coprocessor) utilize their own operating system. Thus, Applicants submit that Woolsey teaches different operating systems executing on both (or a plurality of) the processors and fails to expressly or inherently teach "a computer-readable medium storing a program that, when executed by a multi-processor system, causes only one of a plurality of processors to **execute a single operating system**."

Based at least on the foregoing Applicant submits that claim 20 is allowable over Woolsey, and none of the other art of record satisfy the deficiencies of Woolsey. Accordingly, claim 20 and all claims which depend on claim 20 (claims 21-26) should be allowed.

III. CONCLUSION

In course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments, Inc. Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Scott/

Mark E. Scott
PTO Reg. No. 43,100
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 610-3410 (Phone)
(512) 610-3456 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS